

<p><b>CITY OF SAN JOSÉ, CALIFORNIA</b>          Department of Planning, Building and Code Enforcement          801 North First Street, Room 400          San José, California 95110-1795</p>	<p>Hearing Date/Agenda Number          P.C. 10/22/03 Item 4.d.2.</p>
<h2 style="margin: 0;">STAFF REPORT</h2>	<p>File Number          PDC 02-086</p>
	<p>Application Type          Planned Development Rezoning</p>
	<p>Council District          2</p>
	<p>Planning Area          Edenvale</p>
	<p>Assessor's Parcel Number(s)          Portion of 706-06-015</p>
<p><b>PROJECT DESCRIPTION</b> <span style="float: right;">Completed by: Jeff Roche</span></p>	
<p>Location: Southeast corner of Blossom Hill and Cottle Roads</p>	
<p>Gross Acreage: 18.75                      Net Acreage: 18.75                      Net Density: n/a</p>	
<p>Existing Zoning: IP – Industrial Park      Existing Use: Industrial Park</p>	
<p>Proposed Zoning: IP (PD) Planned Development      Proposed Use: Approximately 222,000 square-feet of commercial uses</p>	
<p><b>GENERAL PLAN</b> <span style="float: right;">Completed by: JR</span></p>	
<p>Land Use/Transportation Diagram Designation          Industrial Park with Mixed Industrial Overlay</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Project Conformance:  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes    <input type="checkbox"/> No  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> See Analysis and Recommendations</p>	
<p><b>SURROUNDING LAND USES AND ZONING</b> <span style="float: right;">Completed by: JR</span></p>	
<p>North: Mobile Home Park &amp; the Intersection Blossom Hill Rd &amp; Monterey Hwy    A(PD) Planned Development and IP – Industrial Park</p>	
<p>East: Railroad, Monterey Highway, Commercial                      A(PD) Planned Development</p>	
<p>South: Industrial Park, Attached Residential Uses                      IP – Industrial Park</p>	
<p>West: Commercial, Community Center, Mini-storage/Warehouse                      R-1-1 – Residence, CN – Commercial Neighborhood and LI – Light Industrial</p>	
<p><b>ENVIRONMENTAL STATUS</b> <span style="float: right;">Completed by: JR</span></p>	
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Environmental Impact Report Pending                      <input type="checkbox"/> Exempt  <input type="checkbox"/> Negative Declaration                      <input type="checkbox"/> Environmental Review Incomplete</p>	
<p><b>FILE HISTORY</b> <span style="float: right;">Completed by: JR</span></p>	
<p>Annexation Title: Monterey Park No. 7                      Date: December 1, 1955</p>	
<p><b>PLANNING DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATIONS AND ACTION</b></p>	
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Approval                      Date: _____                      Approved by: _____  <input type="checkbox"/> Approval with Conditions                      <input type="checkbox"/> Action  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Recommendation</p>	
<p><b>APPLICANT/DEVELOPER/CONTACT</b></p>	<p><b>OWNER</b></p>
<p>Jim Manion          Site Development Manager          Lowe's Home Improvement Warehouse          1530 Faraday Avenue, #140          Carlsbad, CA 92008</p>	<p>Craig Nemson          IBM / Hitachi          Manager, Space Planning and Engineering          5600 Cottle Road          San Jose, Ca. 95193</p>

---

**PUBLIC AGENCY COMMENTS RECEIVED**

---

Completed by: Jeff Roche

Department of Public Works

See attached memoranda.

---

Other Departments and Agencies

See attached memoranda from Department of Transportation, Fire Department & Environmental Services Department. See attached letters from the Santa Clara Valley Water District and the County of Santa, Roads and Airports Department

---

**GENERAL CORRESPONDENCE**

---

See attached correspondence from Jim Manion &amp; Maurice Abraham

See attached memorandum from the Historic Landmarks Commission

See attached letters from Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority, State of California, Department of Transportation, and the Bay Area Quality Management District

See attached petition from the Makati Neighborhood in opposition to the project, and letters from Adams Broadwell Joseph & Cardozo, the Preservation Action Council, Ronald DeChance Terrace Villas HOA, Juanita Morrow, Laura Cunningham, Brian Massey, Brian Maas, Geoff Schuller, Susan Conley, Dawn Axlund, Charlene Ramirez, KC Walsh, Beth Balog, Rhonda Perrella-Wieland, Jeff Winkler Terrace Villas HOA, and the Harvard Design School

---

**ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

---

**BACKGROUND**Project Description

The applicant is proposing the rezoning of an 18.75-acre portion of the former IBM campus from IP Industrial Park to IP (PD) Planned Development Zoning to allow the development of approximately 222,000 square-feet of commercial uses. The project is proposed to be developed in two phases. The first phase on 12.0 acres consists of a 162,000 square-foot big box retail facility to accommodate a new Lowe's Home Improvement Warehouse. The facility includes 135,000 square-feet of retail space and a 27,000 square-foot garden center. The second phase of the project is proposed to include approximately 60,000 square-feet of other retail uses, including up to 7,000 square-feet of restaurant on 6.75 acres. The property owner and project developer are working to re-configure two existing parcels, to create the subject 18.75-acre site from the larger ~178-acre IBM/Hitachi site through the Lot Line Adjustment process. The applicant is requesting the base zoning of IP Industrial Park be retained to provide for alternate development of the site, if the Lowes warehouse is approved but not constructed.

Access to the project site will be from three new driveways along the project's frontage on Cottle Road. Cottle Road provides direct access to Blossom Hill Road, Monterey Highway, and US 101. The primary customer access to the site will be from a central, signalized driveway in the middle of the project site that connects to the Blossom Hill Road on-ramp. Two other secondary access points are located at the northeasterly and northwesterly corners of the subject site.

The primary retail building is proposed as a single-story concrete tilt-up structure located at the rear of the site with parking in front. Two freestanding retail pad buildings are proposed, one adjacent to the primary driveway entrance from Cottle Road and the second at the intersection of Cottle and Poughkeepsie Roads. Maximum building height is

proposed to be 50 feet. Loading and service areas for the main building are located at the rear of the primary retail building, adjacent to Boulder Boulevard. A driveway paralleling Monterey Road along the northerly boundary of the site allows trucks to access the loading facilities without driving through the customer parking lot. The driveway will also provide access to and from the adjacent Hitachi property via a gate located at the southeast corner of the site. This access is expected to be open to through traffic from the Hitachi campus only during shift changes.

### Edenvale Area Development Policy

A change to the Edenvale Area Development Policy is proposed in conjunction with this Planned Development Rezoning. The Policy, which allows specific levels of development to proceed in Edenvale based on programmed but not yet constructed transportation improvements, does not address additional development on the subject site and must be amended to allow this project to proceed in the near term in conformance with City's Transportation Level of Service Policy. This modification of the policy, scheduled to be considered by the Planning Commission immediately before the subject rezoning, is addressed in a separate staff report.

### Existing Site Conditions

The site is currently occupied by three single-story research and development buildings constructed as part of the original South San Jose IBM Campus (Building 25 in 1957, Building 24 in 1973 and Building 30 in 1974). These buildings, including Building 25, which qualifies as a Candidate City Historic Landmark, are proposed for demolition. The remainder of the site consists of paved parking areas and extensive landscaping. A total of 454 trees are located on the site, 164 of which are of ordinance size (18 inches in diameter or greater) and 24 of which are native species. The majority of these trees are proposed for removal (see plan sheet 3.2, Conceptual Tree Preservation and Removal Plan).

### Neighborhood Context

The project is located within the Edenvale Redevelopment Area at the edge of the former IBM campus. Uses surrounding the project site include a mobile home park and the intersection of Blossom Hill Road and Monterey Highway to the north, the railroad and Monterey Highway to the east, industrial park and attached residential uses to the south, and mini-storage, a community center, and commercial uses to the west. The site is also adjacent to three major streets, Monterey Highway, and Cottle and Blossom Hill Roads, and a Caltrain station, located on the westerly side of Monterey Highway approximately 2,000 feet from the project site. The Santa Clara County Valley Transportation Authority currently operates several bus lines providing service to the site, Line 27 on Blossom Hill and Cottle Roads, Line 68 on Cottle Road and Monterey Highway, and Line 72 on Monterey Highway.

## **ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW**

The Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) prepared for the proposed rezoning identifies significant impacts that can be mitigated to an acceptable level in the areas of land use, geology and soils, flooding and drainage, archaeology, transportation, noise, hazardous materials, utilities and energy. The Draft EIR identifies that the project will result in significant unmitigated impacts to historic resources, biological resources, visual/aesthetic resources, and significant, unavoidable impacts to regional air quality. The Draft EIR concludes that this project, together with reasonably foreseeable projects, will result in significant unmitigated cumulative impacts to historic resources and significant unavoidable cumulative impacts to regional air quality. Further discussion of the significant impacts to historic, biological and visual resources and of the potentially significant traffic impacts is provided in the analysis section below. Prior to consideration of the subject Planned Development Rezoning, the Commission will need to find the Environmental Impact Report complete and in conformance with the California Environmental Quality Act. In order to approve the proposed project, the City Council will need to make a finding that there are no feasible project alternatives that would meet the project objectives and avoid the project's significant impacts. A detailed analysis of the project alternatives discussed in

the EIR is provided in the Analysis section below. The Council will also need to adopt a finding of overriding considerations explaining the benefits of the project that warrant approval despite the significant unavoidable impacts.

## **GENERAL PLAN CONFORMANCE**

The proposed rezoning conforms to the General Plan Land Use/Transportation Diagram designation for the site of Industrial Park with the Mixed Industrial Overlay. The General Plan specifies that areas designated with the Mixed Industrial Overlay may be appropriate for a mixture of industrial and compatible commercial uses, including big box retailers. Staff has included conditions in the Draft Development Standards (see attached) to ensure that, in addition to the big box retail, the site accommodates a range of uses that are supportive of and compatible with surrounding industrial uses. The proposed big box and supportive retail uses further the Economic Development Major Strategy of the Plan and the goals of the Edenvale Redevelopment Area by providing employment opportunities for San Jose's residents and strengthening the municipal tax base through increased property and sales tax revenues. The project furthers the Growth Management Major Strategy in its redevelopment of an underutilized infill site within the City's Urban Service Area proximate to housing and to existing transit facilities.

The Historic, Archaeological and Cultural Resource Policies of the General Plan acknowledge that historically significant structures are irreplaceable resources, that their preservation should be a key consideration of the development review process and that the City should foster rehabilitation of buildings of historic significance. The development review process for this project has focused intensely on exploring strategies for preservation of the historically-significant Building 25 (see Analysis section below) and has concluded that implementation of the Lowe's Home Improvement Warehouse on the project site will require demolition of the building.

Based on this analysis, staff concludes that the proposed project is consistent with the site's General Plan Land Use/Transportation Diagram designation, would substantially further the major goals and strategies of the General Plan for economic development and growth management and is consistent with the Historic Resource Policies of the General Plan.

## **PUBLIC OUTREACH**

Notices of the public hearing before the Planning Commission and City Council were published, posted on the City of San Jose web site and distributed to the owners and tenants of all properties located within 1,000 feet of the project site. Additionally, copies of the Draft Environmental Impact Report have been available for public review in both the Martin Luther King Library and the Santa Teresa Branch Library. Staff has received numerous communications from the residents of Makati Circle, located to the southeast of the project site, regarding existing cut-through traffic and a number of letters from historic preservation organizations and advocates emphasizing the historic significance of Building 25 and requesting its preservation.

A Community meeting was held on February 19, 2003, at the Southside Community Center (across the street from the subject site). Topics and issues discussed at that meeting included the following: traffic, safety, cut-through traffic, frequency of truck deliveries and truck routes, labor practices, alternative land uses, the number of trees being removed, potential impacts to the community center and associated facilities, wildlife, loss of Building 25 and alternatives to avoid or mitigate impacts to the significant historic resource, and project signage. On August 21, 2003, the property owner conducted a tour of the existing IBM Building 25 for the City of San Jose Historic Landmarks Commission, Planning Commission and interested members of the public.

## **ANALYSIS**

The primary issues associated with this project include the proposed demolition of Building 25, tree removal, traffic, cut-through traffic, pedestrian circulation, allowed uses and architecture.

## **Demolition of Building 25**

### **Historic Analysis**

The Historic Report, prepared for the project and reviewed by the Historic Landmarks Commission, concludes that the IBM Building 25 is eligible for the National Register of Historic Places, the California Register of Historic Resources and as a City Landmark. The building, constructed in 1957 as part of the initial phase of the new south San Jose IBM campus, was designed by the well-recognized modernist architect John Bolles, who collaborated with the equally well-recognized landscape architect Douglas Bayliss as well as several prominent artists in the design of Building 25 and the IBM campus.

The building is a single-story structure designed with an asymmetrical open floor plan with a central building spine running north to south forming a corridor that connects five wings extending to each side. The wings form landscaped courtyards and garden areas, which are further divided by low decorative block concrete walls. The offices include curtain glass exterior walls providing a direct view of a created natural environment. The building is surrounded on three sides by mature trees and landscaping that provide a private setting away from general view. The condition of the building is extremely poor and deferred maintenance is reaching a critical point for the metal, wood and art elements of the facility.

The landscaping, although extremely overgrown, retains the form, style and popular plants of the 1950's and 60's. Native Oaks and regional redwoods provide visual screening along the site's perimeter. Rows of olive trees separate the parking lanes in the asphalt parking lot. An outdoor sculpture, created by Gurdon Woods and entitled "Research", is located within a fountain element at the main building entrance. The sculpture and fountain have not been maintained and are in poor condition.

Unlike many historic buildings, Building 25 is significant based on more than one of the relevant criteria. The building is significant for its association with inventions and advances in information storage technology, for its association with scientists who are individually significant for their research and advancements of the field and as an exceptional example of Modern architecture. Both the National and California registers incorporate a 50-year age rule for eligibility but provide for cases of exceptional significance at the local, state or national level. Building 25 meets the test of exceptional significance. Based on the findings of the historic analysis, the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) concludes that the proposed demolition of Building 25 would constitute a significant environmental impact.

### **Alternatives Analysis**

In conformance with the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act, the project EIR explored alternatives to the project in order to identify any feasible project alternatives that would meet the project objectives and mitigate the impact on Building 25. In addition to the "No Development Alternative", the alternatives to demolition of the Building 25 discussed in the EIR include: Reuse of Building 25 for Lowe's Center, Project Design Alternatives, Alternative Uses for Building 025 and an Alternative Project Location. These alternatives are discussed below.

***Reuse of Building 25 for Lowe's.*** This alternative proposes the retention of the existing Building 25 and the surrounding landscaping and parking area and reuse of these facilities for the proposed Lowe's Home Improvement Warehouse. The EIR concludes that this alternative is not feasible because the building is too small, the ceiling is too low to accommodate the vertical stacking necessary to maintain an adequate stock of bulky items, and the irregular shape and narrow wings of the building would preclude efficient circulation and layout of display and storage units. The EIR concludes that this alternative would eliminate the significant impact to the historic resource, but would not achieve the objective of providing a viable Lowe's Home Improvement Warehouse on the project site.

**Project Design Alternative.** This alternative consists of a reconfigured site plan, which would accommodate both Building 25 and the proposed Lowe's project (see EIR Figure 13). Building 25 is assumed to be reused for office/research and development uses. The Lowe's building is designed as a two-story structure with a single-story garden center and a single-level parking structure over at-grade parking. This alternative would allow preservation of approximately 320 of the existing 454 trees on the site. This alternative would avoid the significant impact to historic resources and regional air quality as well as the significant visual impacts associated with tree removal. The EIR concludes that this alternative is the environmentally superior alternative (after the "No Project Alternative"), but indicates that it would not meet the project objectives of an efficient and competitive home improvement store. Lowe's has indicated that such a store would be infeasible in that it would cost twice as much to construct, result in a highly inefficient operation and lower customer satisfaction levels (see letter from Jim Manion dated October 15, 2003).

**Additional Design Alternatives.** Two additional alternative building configurations were considered in the EIR that would avoid the significant impact to historic resources, an L-Shaped Lowe's facility with underground parking and a reduced-scale facility consisting of a 94,000 square foot facility, including the garden center. Lowe's has indicated that L-shaped design with underground parking would be physically infeasible in that Lowe's requires operations to be on one level due to the bulk and mass of materials sold. In regard to the reduced-scale alternative, Lowe's has clarified that the 94,000 square-feet represents the sales floor of the store and that the garden center for this prototype requires additional site area. Furthermore, Lowe's has indicated that their smaller format store is intended for a market population of less than 100,000 and that a small market store in this larger market would be infeasible in that it would put the company at a competitive disadvantage in terms of its ability to keep the store stocked with a full range of merchandise.

**Alternative Uses for Building 25.** This alternative explores reuse of Building 25 for a variety of uses including light industrial, office/research and development, school, park and community center. The EIR concludes that the building is not suitable for light industrial uses due to its low ceiling height, lack of adequate power, lack of loading facilities and inappropriate building configuration. The inflexibility of the interior wall design and the poor condition of the building would also discourage its use by office or research and development tenants unless a property owner was willing to risk making the necessary renovations and a tenant could be found that would be attracted to the building for its intrinsic value. The EIR concludes that the building would be difficult to reuse for a public school due to Field Act requirements for seismic upgrades and to a lack of interest by school districts surveyed as part of the analysis. Although a private or trade school might be able to reuse the facility, the EIR concludes that it is unclear what organizations might be interested. In regard to a reuse of the site as a community center or park, the analysis concludes that it would be infeasible during the current tight budget conditions for the City to purchase all or a portion of the site for a public facility. None of these reuse alternatives would meet the applicant's project objectives for implementation of a Lowe's Home Warehouse on the site or fully achieve the City's objective of redevelopment of underutilized property in Old Edenvale to strengthen the City's tax base and create new jobs proximate to housing.

**Alternative Location.** This alternative examines placing the proposed Lowe's facility on a vacant 40-acres site at the northeasterly quadrant of State Route 85 and Almaden Expressway, approximately 4 miles from the project site. The EIR concludes that the use of this site would avoid the significant historic, biological and visual impacts of the project, but would not avoid the regional air quality impact. The EIR indicates that this alternative is environmentally superior to the project, would meet the project objectives, and appears to be feasible. Lowe's has clarified that the project is not located within their defined trade area, that they do not have control of the property and that it would be infeasible for Lowe's to purchase the property.

**Conclusion.** Based on the above analysis, staff concludes that there are no feasible alternatives that would avoid the demolition of Building 25 and achieve the objectives of Lowe's and the City for redevelopment of the underutilized project site with a big box warehouse use and other commercial uses that strengthen the tax base, create new jobs proximate to housing and conform to the City's level of service policies and the neighborhood preservation objectives of the General Plan.

## **Use of the Environmental Impact Report**

The EIR provides environmental clearance for a project that demolishes the historic Building 25 for the purpose of implementing the Planned Development Zoning for the proposed big box retail use as identified on the General Development Plan for the project. In order to ensure that demolition of the historic building is tied to the implementation of the proposed big box retail use, staff has included a condition in the Draft Development standards that requires that the big box retail facility be constructed in the first phase of development, consistent with Lowe's current proposal for the site. In the event that the big box retail proposal is not constructed pursuant to the Planned Development (PD) District, any future industrial or other development proposed under the base "IP" Zoning District would require additional environmental review.

## **Tree Removal**

The project proposes the removal of a large number of significant trees currently existing on the site. Although all 24 of the native trees will be preserved, 365 of the 454 existing trees will be removed as result of the construction of building, parking facilities and other site improvements. The applicant's representative has clarified that the trees proposed for removal are not appropriate for a commercial use where visibility from the street is important to its success (see letter from Maurice Abraham, dated June 19, 2003).

The Environmental Impact Report concludes that the removal of this number of mature trees would result in significant biological and visual impacts that would not be mitigated in the short term by replanting of young trees due to the significant time it would take new trees to reach the level of maturity of the urban forest currently existing on the site. The Project Design Alternative included in the EIR analysis, preserves approximately 320 of the on-site trees, thereby avoiding the significant visual impact and reducing the biological impact. As discussed above, Lowe's has indicated that this alternative would not be feasible because it is based on a two-story structure which would be costly to construct, inefficient for the Lowe's operation and inconvenient for its customers.

The applicant is proposing to provide replacement trees for only the ordinance-size trees proposed for removal. Staff believes that this project should also implement the standard City tree replacement ratios for non-ordinance-size trees and has included a condition to this effect in the Draft Development Standards for the proposed rezoning (see attached).

The Conceptual Landscape Plan for the project provides 197 new 24-inch box specimen trees to be planted on the site, in addition to the 89 existing trees to be retained. Due to space limitations on the existing site, the remaining replacement trees (24-inch box specimens) will need to be planted off site. Staff will work with the applicant to install these additional trees along riparian corridors in the Edenvale Area, along the extension of Hellyer Avenue, as well as along roadway medians in the vicinity of the project. The median of Monterey Highway has been suggested as a good location that is close to the project site. The details of the replacement planting, including a planting program, will be determined as part of the Planned Development Permit process.

## **Traffic**

The traffic analysis included in the Environmental Impact Report for the project indicates that traffic generated by the project will exacerbate the operation of two intersections (US 101 northbound off-ramp/Coyote Road and Silver Creek Valley Road, and US 101 Southbound off-ramp and Blossom Hill Road) operating at unacceptable Level of Service "F": under background conditions including build-out of 5 million future square-feet of industrial development in Edenvale. "Gateway" improvements that will provide an acceptable level of service at these intersections are in the final design stage and are programmed for funding by the Redevelopment Agency. The Edenvale Area Development Policy allows economic development of certain properties in New Edenvale east of US 101 to proceed ahead of the anticipated completion of these programmed gateway improvements. Redevelopment of the subject site was not anticipated at the time the Area Development Policy was formulated and therefore, this underutilized property was not

included. The proposed amendment to the Area Development Policy would include this 18.75-acre site and allow the subject Lowe's development proposal to proceed prior to completion of the gateway improvements, bringing the proposal into conformance with the City's General Plan Level of Service Policy. The project developer has agreed to pay a fair share of the costs of other programmed transportation improvements in the Edenvale area consistent with contributions made for other development proposals in the area.

### **Cut-Through Traffic**

Staff has worked with the applicant to ensure a project design that minimizes the potential that project traffic will use neighborhood streets. The new driveway at the northeasterly corner of the site has been designed to preclude vehicles from turning right out of the site, then proceeding northerly along Cottle Road (under the Blossom Hill Road overpass) and continuing onto Hayes Avenue, a predominately residential street on the northerly side of Blossom Hill Road. Staff will continue to work with the project developer at the Planned Development Permit stage and Public Works Clearance process to refine the design of the improvements at this location (including raised median islands and signs, to better channelize vehicle movement and provide traffic calming) and minimize potential cut-through traffic to the north. These intersection modifications will allow the current traffic flow to continue, but prevent IBM/Hitachi and project traffic from going through the Hayes Avenue neighborhood.

Cut-through traffic concerns have been raised by residents of Makati Circle located to the southwest of the project site (see attached correspondence). These letters indicate a lack of consensus in the neighborhood as to the need for traffic calming under current conditions and whether or not the proposed project will result in additional traffic using neighborhood streets. In response to these concerns, the Department of Transportation has conducted traffic studies of Makati Circle and adjoining streets and based on a careful review of the proposed plans, has concluded that the project will not create an increase in traffic in the Makati Circle area except for local residents who use the residential streets to travel to the new facility.

### **Pedestrian Circulation**

The project site and surrounding neighborhood are currently deficient in pedestrian facilities making it difficult for pedestrians to safely access major streets, bus stops and the Caltrain Station on Monterey Road. In response to this deficiency, the Department of Transportation has prepared a Pedestrian Access Improvement Plan for the area (see attached aerial photo) which provides for safe and convenient pedestrian connections between the Hayes/Blossom Hill/Cottle Road neighborhood and the Ford Road/Monterey Highway neighborhood to the east, and to the Caltrain Station and bus stop located along the westerly side of Monterey Highway. The major elements of the plan include: sidewalks connecting to the Blossom Hill overpass at Monterey Highway, a new pedestrian over-crossing at the Caltrain station, and perimeter sidewalks along the Cottle Road project frontage. In support of this plan, the applicant is proposing to construct new sidewalks along the site's Cottle Road and Endicott Boulevard frontages. City staff will work with the applicant at the Planned Development Permit and Public Works Clearance stages to ensure that the improvements are appropriately designed and that the necessary access easements are recorded. These improvements will further the City's goal of enhancing multi-modal transportation options for residents and employees of the neighborhood.

### **Parking**

The proposed parking ratio for big box retail uses of 3.94 spaces per 1,000 net square-feet of floor area is less than required by the City's Zoning Code. As part of the review for this project, staff requested that the applicant prepare a parking analysis to demonstrate that this ratio would provide a sufficient number of on-site parking spaces. That analysis reviewed parking levels provided at other similar Lowe's Home Improvement Warehouse facilities in other communities. All other proposed parking ratios are consistent with the current parking standards of Title 20. Staff's review of the proposed parking for this facility concluded that the proposed parking ratios would provide adequate on-



site parking to accommodate the proposed uses.

### **Architecture**

The project developer has provided conceptual architecture for Phase 1 as presented in the attached plan set. As proposed, the building includes a level of architectural quality and articulated entry treatments comparable to other recently approved big box retail facilities in the City. As proposed, staff has concluded that the proposed building form and massing will be compatible with adjacent development. Staff will work with the applicant at the Planned Development Permit stage to refine the architecture and associated detailing of Phase I, and to ensure that the architecture of Phase II and the outlying “pad buildings” will be compatible with the overall project, and is of a quality to be compatible with adjoining industrial park uses.

### **Conclusion**

Based on the above analysis, staff concludes that the proposed project is compatible with the surrounding neighborhood, consistent with the City’s development standards and provides a significant opportunity to further important economic goals and strategies of the General Plan through redevelopment of the project site with big box and supportive retail uses on an underutilized infill site proximate to housing and transit facilities in support of the Economic Development and Growth Management strategies of the General Plan.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

Planning staff recommends approval of the subject Planned Development Rezoning for the following reasons:

1. The proposed project is consistent with the site’s General Plan Land Use/Transportation Diagram designation of Industrial Park with a Mixed Industrial Overlay and provides a significant opportunity to further important economic goals and strategies of the General Plan through redevelopment of the project site with big box and supportive retail uses on an underutilized infill site proximate to housing and transit facilities in support of the Economic Development and Growth Management strategies of the General Plan.
2. The project is compatible with surrounding uses.

Cc: Mark Stoner, Lowe’s Home Improvement Warehouse, Sr Real Estate Manager, 1530 Faraday Avenue, #140, Carlsbad, CA 92008  
 Dave Heinrichsen, Nolte Beyond Engineering, 1731 North First Street, Suite A, San Jose, CA 95112-4510  
 BRR Architecture, 6700 Antioch Plaza, Suite 300, Merriam, KS 66204  
 Maurice Abraham, Land Solutions, 1174 Lincoln Avenue, Suite 10, San Jose, CA 95125  
 Mirabel Aguilar/Karen Mack, City of San Jose, Public Works Department  
 Vincent Stephens, Santa Clara Valley Water District, Community Projects Review Unit, Main Building, 5750 Almaden Expressway, San Jose, CA 95118  
 Gloria Sciara, Chair, City of San Jose, Historic Landmarks Commission  
 Judith Henderson, Chair, Preservation Action Council/San Jose, P.O. Box 2287, San Jose, CA 95109  
 Mary Daniels, Lecturer in Architecture, Librarian Special Collections, Harvard Design School, Harvard University, George Gund Hall, 48 Quincy Street, Cambridge, MA 02138  
 Jeff Winkler, Board Member, Terrace Villas HOA, 5707 Makati Circle, #C, San Jose, CA 95123  
 Marc Joseph, Adams Broadwell Joseph & Cardozo, Attorneys at Law, 651 Gateway Boulevard, Suite 900, South San Francisco, CA 94080  
 Ronald DeChance, President, Board of Directors, Terrace Villas, 5368 Makati Circle, San Jose, CA 95123  
 Susan Conley, 5697 Makati Circle, San Jose, CA 95123  
 Juanita Morrow, 5696 Makati Circle, D, San Jose, CA 95123  
 Brian Massey, 5698 Makati Circle, San Jose, CA 95123  
 Brian Maas, 5206 Makati Circle, San Jose, CA 95123  
 Geoff Schuller, 5552 Makati Circle, San Jose, CA 95123  
 Dawn Axlund, 5226 Makati Circle, San Jose, CA 95123  
 KC Walsh, 5689 Makati Circle, San Jose, CA 95123

Beth Balog, 5688 Makati Circle # E, San Jose, CA 95123

:ll